

Revitalizing the Lost Process of Revision

An Honors Thesis (HONRS 499)

by

Emma Clare Baumann

Jennifer Grouling

**Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana**

May 2012

Expected Date of Graduation

December 2012

Revitalizing the Lost Process of Revision

An Honors Thesis (HONRS 499)

by

Emma Clare Baumann

Thesis Advisor
Jennifer Grouling

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Jennifer Grouling", written over a horizontal line.

**Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana**

May 2012

Expected Date of Graduation

December 2012

Abstract

Outside of the Writing Center, the process of revision has been continuously condensed into proofreading and editing. Clients are increasingly visiting the Writing Center with preconceived expectations of the tutor's role as editor, demanding, during the sessions, the address of lower-order above higher-order concerns. Most clients come to the center for help in their composition courses; therefore, the composition professors' portrayal of the Writing Center and the revision process is transmitted onto students; also, this results from the status quo of the "lacking dialogue between writing center workers and composition teachers" (Grimm 1996). The Writing Center and composition courses have a responsibility, as the pivotal writing locations on university campuses, to restore and redefine the lost process of revision. Through conducting interviews with composition instructors and surveys of composition students, this research study reveals the importance of building a relationship between the Writing Center and composition instructors to emphasize content over grammar and to support revision over editing. This study was presented at the East Central Writing Centers Association Conference in March 2012.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Jennifer Grouling for advising me throughout this project, sharing her knowledge of conducting a research project, supporting me through the research process, and viewing me as an equal colleague in Writing Center academia.

I would like to thank the composition instructors who I interviewed and who invited me into their classes to administer surveys to their students.

I would like to thank Dr. Jackie Grutsch McKinney for welcoming me into the Ball State Writing Center community and implanting a lifelong love of tutoring writing within me.

Table of Contents

Abstract and Acknowledgments..... 1

Part I: IRB Documents

Narrative Description of Research Study..... 4

Recruitment Script for English Composition Instructors..... 8

Interview Questions for Composition Instructors.....9

Consent to Participate in Interview Research.....10

Consent to Participate in Research Survey.....13

The Lost Process of Revision Survey.....15

Part II: Revitalizing the Lost Process of Revision

Introduction.....17

Literature Review.....18

Methods.....24

Results.....26

Conclusion.....33

Works Cited.....37

Part III: ECWCA Conference

The Lost Process of Revision.....40

Copy of Conference Presentation Abstract.....49

Part I: IRB Documents

Narrative Description of Research Study

Section 1--Title, Purpose of Study, and Rationale

1.1 Title. Revitalizing the Lost Process of Revision

1.2 Purpose of the study.

The purpose of the study is to understand how composition courses promote the Writing Center in order to revitalize and redefine the lost process of revision.

1.3 Rationale.

The process of revision has been continuously condensed to proofreading and editing as clients are still visiting the Writing Center with preconceived expectations of the tutor's role as editor.

Rather, Writing Centers are structured around helping students through the process of revision and improving their abilities as writers rather than improving the single paper's writing. As Writing Centers are the pivotal writing locations on university campuses, many students are introduced to the Writing Center through their composition courses, which are core requirements all students must take. Therefore, the composition instructors are the bridge to bringing students into the Writing Center. By examining how composition instructors promote the Writing Center to their students, the process of revision can begin to be revitalized and redefined on university campuses.

Section 2--Description of Subject Population

2.1 Number of Subjects. This study will focus on 4-5 composition instructors and 80-100 students.

2.2 Describe the subject population. Participants in the study will be current instructors of composition courses, English 103 and/or 104, at Ball State University and current Ball State students in the specified instructors' composition courses.

2.3 Describe any specified inclusion/exclusion criteria. Participants must be current or former composition instructors or composition students at Ball State University. Participants must be 18 years or older.

2.4 List of Locations. Participants will be current composition instructors or students at Ball State University. The interviews and surveys will take place on the Ball State campus in offices, meeting areas, and classrooms. The paper survey will be administered to the students in their composition courses.

Section 3--Subject Recruitment

3.1 Describe the methods and procedures to be used. Composition instructors will be recruited via email and blog. The composition instructors will be given a copy of the consent form for composition instructors, which they will sign if they consent to participate in the

research project, before the interviews are conducted. The primary researcher will recruit students by visiting the instructors' class. The primary researcher will verbally explain the research being conducted, administer a copy of the consent form to each student (which they will be able to keep and will not hand back to the researcher as the surveys will remain anonymous), and administer the paper survey to those who have read the consent form and agree to take the survey.

Section 4--Methods and Procedures

4.1 Describe the methods and procedures to be used.

Research will be conducted through a series of interviews of the composition instructors conducted by the primary researcher. Interviews will be tape recorded and will then be transcribed. Field notes will also be taken during the interview sessions. Interview data will be confidential.

In addition, research will be conducted through an anonymous paper survey administered by the primary researcher to the current students in the instructors' composition courses.

Section 5--Anonymity/Confidentiality of Data

5.1 Describe how data will be collected and stored.

Data will be collected through interviews completed by the primary researcher. The original interview digital recordings will be stored on the password protected computer of the primary researcher. The paper surveys will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the primary researcher's house. The survey data will be kept on the primary researcher's password protected computer. Data and surveys will be kept for two years and then destroyed.

Section 6--Potential Risk and Benefits

6.1 Describe the potential risks and discomforts.

Risks in this study include possible discomfort on the part of the participant as he or she describes personal experiences in teaching or while answering the paper survey's questions.

6.2 Describe how the risks will be minimized.

I will attempt to minimize risks by identifying myself and my purpose in this study, and explaining the time commitment and level of involvement necessary for participation in the study before it begins. I will make sure that each participant understands that he or she is free to leave the study at any time, and that his or her confidentiality will be protected at all times. The surveys will remain anonymous. Pseudonyms will be used for all research participants.

6.3 Describe the potential benefits.

Potential benefits of the study include a more thorough understanding for the participant of his or her own teaching philosophies and views on Composition and revision as well as the students' understanding and awareness of the campus resources available to them and a more thorough understanding of their own views on revision.

Section 7--Subject Incentives/Inducements to Participate

7.1 Describe any inducements/incentives to participate that will be offered to the subject.

No inducements or incentives will be offered to the subject.

Section 8--Other Financial Considerations

8.1 Describe any financial expense to the subject.

There will be no financial expense to the subject.

8.2 Describe any provisions for compensation for research-related injury.

As the change of research-related injury is very small due to the fact that interviews will be conducted and paper surveys will be administered at a desk or table in the instructor's office or in the composition classroom, there are no provisions for compensation for research-related injury.

Section 9--Informed Consent

It must be emphasized that obtaining informed consent is a conscious process, not merely a perfunctory signature on a piece of paper. It is the researcher's responsibility to make sure that the subject fully understands his or her involvement as a subject in the research project. The consent process, ensuring that the subject understand the procedures and what is expected of him or her, is an ongoing process throughout the duration of the research project.

9.1 Describe the process of obtaining subject's informed consent.

Before the research phase of this project begins, the researcher will explain the study to participants. Participants will be informed of the intent of the study and the parameters of information-gathering will be outlined. The participants will be informed about their obligations in the study, and told that any information they provide will remain confidential. Each interview participant will sign an informed consent release. Students will be given a consent form which they will read before consenting to take the paper survey and which they will not sign in order to keep the surveys anonymous.

9.2 Describe if any of the required elements of the informed consent form must be waived.

No required elements of the informed consent form must be waived.

9.3 Provision of written information about the study without a consent form.

N/A

Section 10--Additional Materials

10.1

Consent Form for Composition Instructors

Consent Form for Composition Students

Recruitment Script
Sample Interview Questions for the Composition Instructors
Sample Survey

Recruitment Script:

Hello English Composition Instructors,

I am conducting a study to understand and examine how composition courses promote the Writing Center in order to revitalize and redefine the process of revision on university campuses.

I am interested in interviewing current composition instructors at Ball State University on their views of the Writing Center and the role that revision plays in their classrooms as well as surveying their students about the Writing Center and revision through a paper survey administered during 20 minutes of the instructor's composition course. If you consent to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in 1-2 interviews with the researcher, which will last approximately 1 hour each, and to allow the researcher to administer the survey to your composition students during 20 minutes of class about their use of the Writing Center and their process of revision. Participation is voluntary and will not affect your job or grade in any class. To participate, please contact Emma Baumann at ecbaumann4@gmail.com. Thank you!

Interview Questions for Composition Instructors

1. Do you have any experience working in Writing Centers? If so, tell me about it.
2. What role does the Writing Center play on the Ball State campus?
3. What role does the Writing Center play in your English 103/104 course?
4. What are the overall goals or objectives of your Eng 103/104 course?
5. Do you teach your students how to revise their writing? If so, how?
6. What are the steps in the process of revision?
7. Do you provide students with the opportunity to revise their writing after receiving a grade? If yes, why and how? If no, why not?
8. How do you respond to student writing when grading?
9. Describe what good writing looks like to you.
10. What criteria do you use to evaluate a student's writing?
11. How do you plan on using peer review in class? What do you view as the benefits and drawbacks to using peer review?
12. What amount of emphasis do you place on grammar in student writing?
13. What portion of the student's grade is most heavily weighted? (e.g. organization, grammar, content, etc.)
14. What is the role of the composition course you are teaching in relation to the composition program?
15. What are the overall aims of the composition program?

Consent to Participate in Interview Research

Study Title

Revitalizing the Lost Process of Revision

Study Purpose and Rationale

The purpose of the study is to understand how composition courses promote the Writing Center in order to revitalize and redefine the process of revision.

Participation Procedures and Duration

For this project, you will be asked to participate in 1-2 interviews. These interviews will last approximately 1 hour each as well as allow the researcher to administer a paper survey to the instructor's composition students during approximately 20 minutes of your composition course.

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

You must be a current composition instructor at Ball State University. You must be 18 years or older.

Audio Recordings

For purposes of accuracy, with your permission, interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed. The audio files will be stored on a password-protected computer.

All recordings will be kept for the duration of the research project, but will be destroyed upon request.

Data Confidentiality or Anonymity

All data will be maintained as confidential. In any dissemination of the research results, your identity will be protected by use of a pseudonym.

Storage of Data

Digital files (including audio recordings) will be stored on the researcher's password-protected computer. Only the researchers will have access to the data. Unless otherwise requested by the participant, all data will be stored for two years and then destroyed.

Risks or Discomforts

Being interviewed may result in feelings of discomfort. You may ask the researcher to discontinue the interview or refuse to answer a question. You may quit the study at any time without penalty or prejudice.

Participating in this study will not affect your employment in any way.

Who to Contact Should You Experience Any Negative Effects from Participating in this Study

Should you experience any feelings of discomfort while participating in this study, there are counseling services available to you as a BSU instructor through the Counseling Center at Ball State University, 765-285-1376.

Benefits

One benefit you may gain from participating in this study may be a more thorough understanding of your teaching philosophies and view of Composition and revision.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to withdraw your permission at any time for any reason without penalty or prejudice. Participation in this study will not affect your employment in any way. Please feel free to ask any questions of the investigator before signing this form and at any time during the study.

IRB Contact Information

For one's rights as a research subject, please contact the Director of the Office of Research Integrity, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070, irb@bsu.edu.

Consent

I, _____, agree to participate in this research project entitled, “The Lost Process of Revision.” I have had the study explained to me and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have read the description of this project and give my consent to participate. I understand that I will receive a copy of this informed consent form to keep for future reference.

To the best of my knowledge, I meet the inclusion/exclusion criteria for participation (described on the previous page) in this study.

Participant’s Signature _____ Date: _____

Researcher Contact Information

Principal Investigator:
Emma Baumann, Undergraduate
English Department
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306

Faculty Supervisor:
Dr. Jennifer Grouling
English Department
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306

Consent to Participate in Research Survey

Study Title

Revitalizing the Lost Process of Revision

Study Purpose and Rationale

The purpose of the study is to understand how composition courses promote the Writing Center in order to revitalize and redefine the process of revision.

Participation Procedures and Duration

For this project, you will be asked to participate in an approximately 15 minute paper survey.

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

You must be a current composition student at Ball State University. You must be 18 years or older.

Data Confidentiality or Anonymity

All data will be maintained as anonymous.

Storage of Data

Digital files of data will be stored on the researcher's password-protected computer. Only the researchers will have access to the data. Unless otherwise requested by the participant, all data will be stored for two years and then destroyed.

Risks or Discomforts

Being interviewed may result in feelings of discomfort. You may refuse to answer a question on the survey. You may quit the study at any time without penalty or prejudice.

Participating in this study will not affect your course grade in any way.

Who to Contact Should You Experience Any Negative Effects from Participating in this Study

Should you experience any feelings of discomfort while participating in this study, there are counseling services available to you as a BSU student through the Counseling Center at Ball State University, 765-285-1376.

Benefits

One benefit you may gain from participating in this study may be a more thorough understanding of your view of Composition and revision.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to withdraw your permission at any time for any reason without penalty or prejudice. Participation in this study will not affect your grade in any way. Please feel free to ask any questions of the investigator before signing this form and at any time during the study.

IRB Contact Information

For one's rights as a research subject, please contact the Director of the Office of Research Integrity, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070, irb@bsu.edu.

The Lost Process of Revision Survey

Participation in this survey is voluntary and will not affect your course grade in any way. Your answers to this survey are anonymous. By completing this survey you agree to allow the researchers to view and use your results in their study. This survey has been approved by the Ball State Institutional Review Board.

- 1. Have you ever visited the Writing Center?** Yes No

If yes, what stage in the writing process did you work on (circle all that apply):

Brainstorming Outlining Researching
Revising Internal Structure Creating a Thesis Editing Grammar

If yes, how would you rate your experience at the Writing Center? (1=lowest and 5=highest)

Helpful 1 2 3 4 5

- 2. On average, how many times do you revise a paper before turning it in?**

0 1 2 3 4 5 6+ (unsure)

- 3. Please list the steps of revision that you take when you do revise a paper:**

- 4. Do you plan on visiting the Writing Center in the future? Why or why not?**

Part II: Revitalizing the Lost Process of Revision

Revitalizing the Lost Process of Revision

Introduction

Since the 1970s, revision has developed from being “a mechanical process involving little more than correcting errors or making minor changes in sentence structure or word choice to improve style” to primarily being concerned “with issues of audience, purpose, content, organization, and style [...to shape] the intended meaning of the text” (Bamberg 79). While both writing center directors and composition instructors recognize this development of revision, composition students have maintained the idea that revision consists primarily of the old mechanical process of editing that occurs after the paper is written. When surveying students in composition courses at Ball State University, only four out of the 53 students surveyed mentioned revising structure as part of their revision process with 31 out of the 53 students strictly mentioning grammar as revision. Global revision has become a lost process in academia that must be vitalized through the effort of the writing programs at universities. University instructors outside of the Writing Program view both writing centers and composition courses as service resources to “fix” students’ grammar, placing emphasis on lower-order rather than higher order concerns (North 45). Since both resources are crucial parts of the writing programs on university campuses and are both working toward the same goal to improve students’ rhetoric and writing, composition courses and writing centers must unite to support each other in their efforts toward teaching students to apply global revision strategies as well as collaborate in redefining their roles as valuable writing resources on campus.

The service missions of the composition courses and writing centers share many similarities. At Ball State University, students are required to take English 103, or its

equivalent, English 101 and 102, and English 104. English 103 focuses on developing students' understanding of rhetoric and writing while English 104 focuses on advancing students' understanding and application of the research process. The Ball State Writing Center provides "writing support [...] through free one-to-one feedback sessions" ("The Writing Center"). Unfortunately, while both services "develop in students the ability to make decisions about [writing and] organization that take into account the relationship between form, content, and context," Nancy Maloney Grimm's argument (1996) that "a lack of dialogue between writing center workers and composition teachers maintains the status quo" remains true over fifteen years later (Gilles 5; 524). To redefine and vitalize the lost process of revision, composition instructors must promote the writing center in their courses, teach students multiple revision strategies, use peer review in a beneficial way, and emphasize content over grammar when grading while writing centers need to better communicate their purpose to composition instructors as well as provide educational programs for composition instructors that are based on writing center research. In order to uncover ways in which the process of revision can be redefined and vitalized, I focused my study on the relationship between composition courses and writing centers and how they communicate the process of revision to university students, interviewing three composition instructors, surveying their composition students, and studying Ball State composition course syllabi.

Literature Review

Until the 1970s, revision had been viewed as primarily sentence-level editing (Bamberg 80). Centuries before then, Aristotle revised in a linear format, structuring his ideas in paragraphs and then performing line-by-line editing, which then transferred over to writers

during the Renaissance era (Bamberg 80). While 18th-century rhetoricians rejected Aristotle's detailed attention to language use, Aristotle's linear revision process later revitalized in the 1960s and 70s in Britton's "model of the writing process[:] conception—incubation—production" and Rohman's "suggestion that the composing process moves from prewriting to writing to rewriting" (qtd. in Sommers 100); these processes do not allow for global revisions beyond sentence-level structure, which continues to remain problematic in American universities today. Grammar editing developed prestige in the 19th century in America when Harvard, in 1874, set the example for other universities, requiring an entrance exam in which students had to write a short paper with correct "spelling, punctuation, grammar, and expression" (Bamberg 80); this concept of writing continues to impact universities' perceptions of writing centers and composition courses.

The Writing Center's mission is to offer trained peer feedback to writers of any level at any stage of the writing process. Yet, while writing centers have developed this mission within their own walls, the outside university faculty and students still perceive them as being services to help strictly poor writers with their grammar. Jasna R. Shannon states, "Most writing centers are seen as remedial centers for struggling writers" (368). Sadly, even faculty within the English Department inaccurately hold this notion of the center described by Shannon as well as Stephen North as they frequently send students to the Center for assistance with their grammar. In his article, "The Idea of a Writing Center," North expresses his frustration of the misperceptions of the Writing Center as a resource to help only writers with "special problems" (46); North combats the idea that the Center is only a grammar editing service or "fix-it shop," expanding its purpose toward a student-centered approach to create "better writers not better writing" (47; 50). Writing centers are constantly attempting to move away from the idea that revision is linear with

the final step of strictly editing when finished with the rough draft as well as fighting to redefine this aging perception that their purpose is to edit students' papers.

Writing centers are striving to refocus their mission around the idea of the revision process as recursive. According to a study done by Nancy Sommers, experienced writers conduct revision according to a recursive process, where revising occurs throughout the writing process (106). Similarly, Donald Murray states, "all writing is rewriting" (46). With the contemporary idea of revision as ongoing and repetitious, writing center tutors work with students throughout the writing process, providing one-on-one conferences in which students learn strategies of revision for all stages of the writing process. The tutors do not edit line-by-line, but rather work with the students to help them learn to revise on their own in the future (Gillespie and Lerner 23). Resisting the idea of editing, writing centers avoid writing on students' papers and claim themselves as tutors or consultants rather than editors, and yet the misperception of writing centers as services remains alive today.

Just as writing centers are viewed as services, so also are composition courses. According to Roger Gilles, many people "still view first-year composition as a fix-it course" (3). In opposition to this view, Bamberg argues that the composition course's purpose, similar to the writing center's purpose, is to assist students toward independently applying the composing process, teaching students revision strategies similar to writing center tutors (96). Greater than service courses, composition courses build from the Liberal Arts mission to help students "make meaning from information, [...] become their own teachers, [and] develop the capacity to see and understand perspectives of people different from themselves" (Gilles 7). Viewing composition courses as a service course underestimates and undervalues composition instructors' important role in developing well-rounded, critical thinkers and writers of their students; in spite

of composition instructors' frustration with this misperception, they continue to maintain their similar misperception of writing centers.

Nancy Maloney Grimm argues that this misunderstanding exists as a result of the lack of dialogue between writing centers and composition courses ("Rearticulating the Work" 524). Grimm suggests that writing centers should not reject and ignore their past but, rather, should reconnect with and build from their history of having a remedial focus; with this, writing centers can define a new position of practice based on Vygotsky's theory of interactive learning, which lies at the foundation of every tutoring session ("Getting Unstuck" 92). Through interactive learning, students are involved in the process of revision, which allows students to develop skills as writers that are not limited to editing. To further enhance this shift in missions toward interactive learning, Grimm calls for writing centers to rearticulate their goals and purposes, keeping them open as well as expanding the idea of literacy to become plural; Grimm argues that writing centers should support the notion of multiple literacies rather than one literacy. Consequently, they will leave behind their subordinate positions and assist student writers in discovering and shaping their own individual styles of writing rather than conforming their writing to an instructor's singular literacy ("Rearticulating the Work" 544).

To overcome this service position through creating dialogue between composition instructors and writing centers, research shows that both writing centers and composition courses must reach out to each other in various ways. North urges instructors to ask tutors to come to their classes and introduce the Writing Center as well as "establish resource libraries for writing teachers" (53; 57). Shannon suggests that both tutors and directors send letters to faculty at the beginning of the year as well as send session reports to professors with a description of what was worked on during the session. Each of these suggestions attempts to build "the network of

relationships” that Grimm believes are essential to change (“Getting Unstuck” 83).

Not only do composition courses and writing centers desire to avoid the idea of being remedial services, they also both want to redefine the process of revision as recursive. To do this, composition instructors and writing center tutors need to teach students the craft of revision rather than editing. In her study (1980), Sommers explores the difference of revision between experienced writers and student writers, finding that most student writers did not make global revisions but rather focused on sentence-level revisions, such as replacing words and “cleaning up the paper” (102). Therefore, revision to student writers is a rewording activity rather than a critical thinking activity with an awareness of audience and purpose. Experienced writers, on the other hand, “seek to discover (to create) meaning in the engagement with their writing, in revision” (105). They view revision as a recursive process in which they revise to clarify their ideas for their audience and create specific meanings to clearly address their writing purpose. Sommers concluded that student writers do not feel compelled to revise if the writing seems to flow and sounds okay, placing emphasis on grammar (103). In line with this study, Gillespie and Lerner argue that once the students who desire strictly grammar assistance in the writing center have their sentences and punctuation correct, they feel their writing is perfect (29). These student writers are not aware of revision strategies and the multiple steps of revision, especially the critical thinking steps. The most important step that pertains to both the mission of the writing center and composition courses is the idea of “making meaning from information” (Gilles 7); if student writers in composition courses and tutees in the writing center are not assisted to write something with meaning, then composition instructors and writing center tutors are not fulfilling their mission.

Composition instructors, when commenting on students’ papers, need to work toward this

mission of improving students' critical thinking in their writing, but many instructors' style of response to student papers actually works against this mission. Instructors use a variety of response styles, which, according to Chris Anson, consist of the dualistic, relativistic, and reflective (Anson 343). The dualist and relativist responders do not push students to critically think when writing; dualist responders, the majority of teachers, focus on the students' correctness of writing while relativist responders avoid judging the students' writing altogether (Anson 344; 349). Instructors only advocate critical thinking in student writing when they respond reflectively, commenting on a range of issues (Anson 351). Summer Smith focuses on these type of responses that comment on a range of issues, breaking down instructors' end comments into three different groups of genres: judging, reader response, and coaching (252). Within the judging genre, the instructor evaluates the development, style, entire paper, correctness, and so on, while, in the reader response genre, the instructor focuses on the reading experience (Smith 253). The coaching genre is the most important genre to the revision process as the instructor makes suggestions to the student for the revision of this current paper or future papers with only a few instructors offering extra assistance (Smith 253). In the judging genre, the instructors' evaluation of correctness had the highest percentage of negative comments (95%) (Smith 254). Smith argues that the most effective end comments were those that were specific and personalized rather than those that were generically conventional and that referred to the paper rather than the student (267). Instructors' responses to student writing influence students' view of the process of both writing and revision.

As revision is a learned process, composition instructors can also use peer review workshops to teach students how to critically think about revision. Peer review can be crucial in students learning to improve their writing, yet, often times, students will only focus on sentence-

level revisions in peer review (Bamberg 84-85). Students can be uncomfortable in providing critical feedback to their peers and, as they do not understand how to revise globally, they only edit (Bamberg 91). In an effort to increase the effectiveness of peer review, Bamberg suggests that instructors should provide self-evaluation guides that are specific to the instructor's expectations to assist students in critically thinking about the author's rhetorical decisions involving his or her thesis and structure (91). Instructors should, also, previous to the peer review workshop, discuss with students "the difference between local and global revisions of a text" as it prompts students to apply this knowledge to their peer reviews (Bamberg 92). While research on peer review shows disadvantages, Bamberg urges instructors to properly conduct them in their classrooms in order to help students learn to revise independently. The mission of both composition courses and writing centers is to improve student writing by teaching students about the revision process and revision strategies; therefore, critics argue for a stronger relationship between the two services to truly impact students' confidence in writing and the revision process.

Methods

To explore ways this gap can be filled between writing centers and composition courses, I received consent from IRB for my research proposal to interview three Ball State composition instructors and survey Ball State composition students in English 102, 103, and 104. I interviewed three voluntary Ball State composition instructors, from whom I received written consent, for approximately thirty minutes each. I asked each questions pertaining to revision and the role of the Writing Center within their courses. The following are some sample questions I asked the instructors: "How do you respond to student writing when grading?"; "How do you plan on using peer review in class? What do

you view as the benefits and drawbacks to using peer review?"; and "What role does the Writing Center play on the Ball State campus?" The instructors' names have been kept confidential and pseudonyms are applied in this paper.

I then administered surveys to the composition instructors' students in one of their Eng 102, 103, or 104 courses, with a total of 53 surveys for the three classes. The survey was voluntary and anonymous. It included four questions pertaining to the students' revision process and previous use of the Writing Center. Two example questions are: "Have you ever visited the Writing Center? If yes, what stage in the writing process did you work on?" and "On average, how many times do you revise a paper before turning it in?"

Finally, I examined the Ball State English 103 and 104 composition syllabi from Fall 2011 and Spring 2012. I looked at whether the syllabi included an informational promotion section for the Writing Center and analyzed the instructors' language to see how it would appeal to students.

During my study, I experienced some limitations. As I never observed the instructors and students, I was unable to view the instructors' peer review workshops to know its level of effectiveness on the students' revision process. I was also unable to track each student's individual progress throughout the semester to know how much the instructors' teaching, as well as the students' visits to the Writing Center, impacted the students' learning and writing. With this, since I surveyed the students around midterms and did not follow up with them at the end of the semester course, I was unable to know whether the students utilized the Writing Center later in the semester more than prior to midterms. Finally, I was unable to accurately know whether students visited the Writing

Center more if the syllabus statement was more appealing than the overused standard statement.

Results

When looking at Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 syllabi for Ball State composition courses, the written promotion for the Writing Center was not as present or compelling as it could have been to convince students the service is worth pursuing. 40% of the Fall 2011 Eng 103 and Eng 104 syllabi, 37% of the Spring 2012 Eng 103 syllabi, and 47% of the Spring 2012 Eng 104 syllabi did not even briefly mention the Writing Center in their syllabi; syllabi are valuable advertising places for instructors to advocate student use of the Writing Center because, during the first class of the semester, all students receive a syllabus that includes their semester projects and class expectations. When introducing these projects or papers, instructors can suggest that students take advantage of the Writing Center by referring to their advertisement in the syllabi. If the instructor links a paper to the Writing Center, the student will then see the practical use of the Writing Center and feel more compelled to set up an appointment. It is especially important for composition courses to advertise it because the course goal is to improve students' writing and rhetoric, which is exactly the same goal as the Writing Center. Building on this, since most students at Ball State are required to take the Writing Program's composition courses as part of the common core curriculum, the Writing Program should be one of the main channels through which the Writing Center is promoted, working together to support each other and the students. Still though, many of the instructors continue to ignore and not promote the Writing Center.

However, many of the syllabi that did mention the Writing Center did so with enthusiasm and recognized its services as more valuable than being “the grammar police.” Most instructors used the standard statement: “The Writing Center at Ball State offers free one-to-one writing feedback to all students in all classes. Peer tutors can help students with many writing projects from essays to PowerPoint presentations to resumes, and at all stages from brainstorming to final drafts.” This standard statement correctly defines the purposes of the Writing Center, but it remains detached in its rhetoric and is unappealing to students. Rather, the most effective statements were ones in which the instructors highly suggested and recommended going to the Writing Center as well as stressing that “tutors will not proofread student work” and that “you will not find the grammar police” there. An English 104 instructor, Angela, who I also interviewed, wrote, “The Writing Center is full of awesome people,” demonstrating that the Center is not intimidating. Another instructor states, “Students who work with the Writing Tutors consistently turn in better papers because they have gone through the editing and revision process again,” advocating the helpfulness of the tutors to the students in her particular class. Personalizing writing center promotions is of the utmost importance for students in order to make its services less intimidating and more appealing in its effectiveness. Since most students are required to take composition courses early in their college careers, composition instructors play a crucial role in properly introducing students to writing centers in order for students to then take full advantage of its uses throughout their college experiences.

Writing a strong, personalized statement in the composition syllabus is an effective and simple way for composition courses to begin merging their efforts with writing centers

toward improving students' revision processes, but, as North suggests in "The Idea of a Writing Center," it is even better for students to listen to a presentation by a writing center tutor (53). However, the best way is for students to tour the Writing Center with the class, as students are then able to assign a tutor's face and a specific place with the Writing Center. As sharing one's writing with tutors can be intimidating, seeing the place and tutors can decrease this anxiety. When introducing the Center, tutors should stress that the Center is useful to any writer at any writing level to dispel the stereotype that three students voiced when surveyed about visiting the Center in the future; they responded, "Overall, it seemed like a resource below my writing level," "I don't see the need," and "I have never really struggled with writing." These students incorrectly see writing centers as resources only for poor, struggling writers; instructors and writing center directors and tutors are responsible for changing this stereotype through promoting the Writing Center as a place for writers of all levels.

Also when surveyed, 39 out of 53 students expressed that peer reviews are useful. The last two students mentioned, who both expressed that they would not visit the writing center in the future, also indicated that they found peer reviews helpful, respectively stating, "you get others' perspectives on how to write your paper in the most effective way" as well as "it allows someone else to look for mistakes and see if it is clear enough to understand." Both students' views on peer review mirror the purpose of writing center tutoring sessions. Peer tutors provide another perspective and feedback to student writers on their papers and help them clearly communicate their ideas. The students' expressed interest in receiving another perspective on their paper fits exactly with the service that the writing center provides for free to students. With such a positive response from

students regarding peer review, writing centers should consider advertising as a peer review service that provides strong, helpful writing feedback from peers in a pressure-free environment.

Many composition instructors teach revision through peer review workshops, seeing it as beneficial in teaching students the communal aspect of revision as well as increasing the students' critical thinking skills, yet instructors worry about its effectiveness. Brad, an Eng 104 instructor, states, "Effective revision is a skill that you have to acquire." Therefore, it is the composition courses and writing centers' responsibility to teach students how to effectively revise. Brad fears that if he "didn't give [the students] any worksheet with questions to respond to, and I just said, 'Read each others' papers and tell each other what you thought of it,' you'd probably only get responses like 'Oh, it was good' or 'I really liked it.'" In these responses, students are not engaged in critically thinking about the writer's rhetorical moves. To better approach peer review workshops, Brad and Angela, another Eng 104 instructor, both modeled effective questioning for peer review as a whole class to then prepare the students to continue this critical thinking in smaller groups. Writing centers similarly push students to engage in critically thinking about their writing when revising through asking the client multiple questions such as, "Where is your thesis? Why did you decide to put your thesis at the end of this particular paragraph?" When peer review teaches students to critically think during the revision process about all angles of their paper rather than only grammar, the students are learning how to see their paper globally.

Not only do peer review and the writing center allow students to critically think about their writing, students are also learning the communal aspect of revision by reading

their work aloud to an audience. Mary Ann, an English 102 instructor, states, “I think reading a draft aloud is probably the single most important thing you can do for revision. I think when you read a draft aloud in front of an audience, you’re being held responsible for what you wrote in a very tangible way.” The three instructors I interviewed each stressed not only the importance of hearing “your voice” (Angela), but also the importance of being held accountable for their writing. With these same ideas in mind, tutors at the Writing Center ask the clients to read their own writing aloud during sessions. Students are then able to understand the reader-writer relationship when they share their work with others and see the practical need for clarity in their structure and style in order for the reader to comprehend their message; by teaching revision as a communal process, the students’ ideas of revision expand from just surface-level revisions to more global revisions based on their use of sources, credibility, organization, and thesis.

Mary Ann expresses her concern for peer review, which many instructors share, stating, “I don’t know how beneficial the comments they’re getting from their peers really are.” On the survey, the few students that disliked peer reviews indicated similar reasons to the instructors’ concern, writing that peer review effectiveness “depends on if you have a helpful peer” and “a lot of times students do not revise my paper well.” While hesitations exist about the benefits of peer review, students are calling for it when it is taught with proper instruction as one student in Angela’s class insists, “they are the only part of the revision process [that] I believe is essential.”

Through modeling the revision and peer review process as well as teaching multiple revision strategies throughout the class, students can, as according to Brad, “figure out what kind of questions will illicit good feedback [with...] the instructor’s help.” As Angela

asserts, revision is now seen as a cyclical process. It is a process in which the writer is constantly revising throughout the process of writing, moving a paragraph or changing the thesis; therefore, if instructors are teaching students that revision is a process that occurs only at the end of writing a rough draft where they receive feedback on grammar from their peers, students view revision as just that. This was seen in the students' survey responses. Instead, composition instructors should try, as Angela does, to "incorporate peer review into the body of [their] class and [...] not isolate it as this thing that [they] do four times a semester." With this, composition instructors should conduct peer reviews throughout the writing process, grouping students at the beginning to brainstorm topics, then in the middle to discuss their thesis and use of supporting sources, and at the end to discuss structure. Likewise, writing centers should promote their services as places to help students at any part in the writing process from brainstorming to researching to organizing information into paragraphs. Consequently, students will begin to see revision as a process rather than a final step taken to quickly fine tune the surface of the writing before turning it in for a grade.

Along with a change in revision, the type of feedback instructors provide to students' papers has changed and developed. Each instructor personalizes his or her own style of response, and as has happened with Mary Ann and Angela, those styles will "totally alter [...] over the years" as new theories develop with the process of writing. When answering about the feedback they provide on students' papers, each composition instructor first mentioned feedback on "misspellings and grammatical errors" rather than content (Mary Ann). Brad first states, "I make all these surface comments in the margins," while Angela states, "I'll pick specific concrete things they can work on. So if their grammar

is a mess, and I can't understand shit in their paper, then I'll say, 'Your grammar is a mess. Come meet with me.'" Even while the current theory of the writing process does not focus strictly on grammar, instructors' quick responses about grammar in relation to grading illustrate the significance that grammar has on the students' grades. According to Brad, "even the most nonprescriptive instructor is going to mark blatant grammar errors because that's just part of it, because that's a rhetorical strategy in and of itself." As this may be true, the emphasis that instructors place on grammar when grading influences students' emphasis on grammar during the revision process; this can hinder students' view of revision as only editing to make the paper "correct," which Anson argues in relation to the dualist responder (345).

When grading, instructors need to consider the significance of their comments on students' view of writing. If the instructor grades the paper based on its grammar, the idea that good writing is based mostly on grammatical correctness will transfer over to the students and continue to reinforce students' steps of revision as editing. Each interviewed instructor provides "more substantial comments [on] the actual structure of the paper" than on grammar; Brad dedicates approximately 70% of his feedback to comments and the rest to superficial form "because [he] wants them to get the message that their message and the content of the paper is what's more important than the form." Composition instructors should be aware of how much time and space they use to address grammar versus content in feedback; instructors need to consciously emphasize the importance of content over grammar in order to positively impact students toward elevating the revision process of structure and content above strictly grammar editing and also to redesign composition courses not as service courses, but as courses that emphasize students' critical

thinking skills. By responding to an array of concerns, using specific and personalized comments like reflective responders, and including some coaching comments with an offer of assistance, students will be able critically participate in the revision process with guidance (Anson 351; Smith 258).

To combat this, instructors should provide students with end comments that provide specific concrete ways to improve the paper as well as provide students with the opportunity to revise their papers (Anson 351). Few English 103 and 104 courses publicly allowed revision in their syllabi, but, those that did, embrace the idea of revision as a large encompassing process. An English 104 professor stresses revision as he writes in his syllabi, the student's overall grade takes "into account how well you incorporated feedback and improved your writing based on your own efforts (reading, researching, writing center help, etc.) as well as comments made by others." As part of the coaching genre, the instructor encourages students to use the Writing Center, a helpful resource for the revision process, in this description of her revision policy (Smith 258). Only four of the 47 syllabi for English 104 Spring 2012 indicate opportunities for revision after grading. While student revision after grading takes sacrifice on the instructor's part to re-grade the students' papers, revision allows for extensive critical thinking and development of the students' writing skills as they learn from their previous mistakes. The Writing Center can be a supportive resource for instructors to help make these revisions possible within the Writing Program.

Conclusion

Writing centers need to reach out to composition course instructors to redefine their purpose within writing programs as well as create a meaningful role they can play

within the instructors' courses. Brad describes the Writing Center as another part of his "coaching team" and Angela describes it as "a go between the instructor and the student." Writing centers should be places for students to turn for writing assistance in a pressure-free environment that instructors can trust to provide strong intelligent writing feedback to their students. In his syllabus, an Eng 104 instructor promotes the Writing Center to his students as a resource to use, because "the reality is that I will not have time to work with each one of my students individually whenever they might need help." The Writing Center can be that extra support system for instructors, and, with their help, instructors can allow students the opportunity to revise after consulting with a writing center tutor and requiring that the revisions be more global than strictly editing as many students rarely place the effort into making global revisions when given the opportunity to revise, focusing instead on easier grammar edits. In order to provide the best service for composition instructors' students, instructors could present their projects and papers to the Writing Center directors and tutors so they trust the tutors understand the assignment and can provide the composition students with effective feedback; to do this, writing center directors must build relationships with composition instructors.

In addition to expanding students' opportunities for revision, by interacting with and using writing centers to their full potential, composition instructors can learn helpful instruction strategies. Angela states, "Writing center research can help me be a better instructor in my classroom." Writing centers can provide educational programs each month that teach composition instructors new revision strategies as well as give writing tools that the instructors can present to their students. At these meetings, composition instructors can also inform the tutors about their class updates on assignments and papers

that they can expect in the coming weeks as well as answer any questions the tutors might have about the assignments that composition students are presently bringing to the Writing Center. Through these meetings, writing centers and composition instructors could truly begin to communicate and work together toward the goal of improving student writing.

Further research can be conducted to build a deeper understanding of the relationship between writing centers and composition courses and their impact on students' knowledge and application of revision strategies. More concentrated research needs to follow the individual progress of the composition students' writing based on the composition instructor's teaching methods to learn how best to teach revision strategies to the students; this research should focus on the amount of revision a student participates in, whether the instructor and student utilize the writing center, and how peer review workshops are conducted. Further research can also address the syllabi statements, tracking the effectiveness of a more personal syllabus statement on the course's student use of the Writing Center.

Building a partnership at the university level between writing centers and composition courses is of the utmost importance in vitalizing and redefining the lost process of revision. As students continue to view revision as editing, composition instructors and writing centers need to work in tandem to properly promote the Writing Center, model revision and effective peer review sessions, provide thoughtful responses to students' papers that emphasize content over grammar, and provide opportunities for students to revise their papers. To truly make an impact on students' understanding of

revision as a whole, writing centers and composition courses must build a relationship founded on trust, communication, and an appreciation for the other's service.

Works Cited

- Anson, Christopher M. "Response Styles and Ways of Knowing." *Writing and Response: Theory, Practice, and Research*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1989. 332-66. Print.
- Clark, Irene L., and Betty Bamberg. "Revision." *Concepts in Composition: Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates, 2003. 79-106. Print.
- Gilles, Roger. "The Departmental Perspective." *Strategies for Teaching First-year Composition*. Ed. Duane H. Roen, Veronica Pantoja, Lauren Yena, and Eric Waggoner. By Susan K. Miller. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2002. Print.
- Gillespie, Paula, and Neal Lerner. *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Peer Tutoring*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2000. Print.
- Grimm, Nancy Maloney. "Getting Unstuck: Rearticulating the Nodal Points." *Good Intentions: Writing Center Work for Postmodern times*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook-Heinemann, 1999. Print.
- Grimm, Nancy Maloney. "Rearticulating the Work of the Writing Center." *College Composition and Communication* 47.4 (1996): 523-48. Print.
- Murray, Donald Morison. *The Craft of Revision*. 3rd ed. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College, 1998. Print.

- North, Stephen M. "The Idea of a Writing Center." *The St. Martin's Sourcebook for Writing Tutors*. By Christina Murphy and Steve Sherwood. 4th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2011. Print.
- Shannon, Jasna R. *Strategies for Teaching First-year Composition*. Ed. Duane H. Roen, Veronica Pantoja, Lauren Yena, and Eric Waggoner. By Susan K. Miller. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2002. Print.
- Smith, Summer. "The Genre of the End Comment: Conventions in Teacher Responses to Student Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 48.2 (1997): 249-68. Print.
- Sommers, Nancy. "Revision Strategies of Students Writers and Experienced Adult Writers." *Concepts in Composition: Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates, 2003. 79-106. Print.
- "The Writing Center." *Ball State University*. Ball State University, 2012. Web. 18 May 2012. <<http://cms.bsu.edu/Academics/CentersandInstitutes/WritingCenter.aspx>>.

Part III: East Central Writing Centers Association Conference

The Lost Process of Revision:

ECWCA Conference Presentation Paper

Since the 1970s, revision has transformed from asking questions after writing a paper, such as “Is ‘received’ a better word than ‘got’?” and “Should I put a comma here?” to asking more global questions before, during, and after writing the paper, such as “Would this paragraph better follow the first paragraph?” and “Will my audience view my argument as credible? And if not, how can I make it more credible?” Both writing center directors and composition instructors recognize this development of revision, yet composition students have maintained the idea that revision consists primarily of the old mechanical process of editing. When I surveyed students in composition courses at Ball State University, only four out of the 53 students surveyed mentioned revising overall structure as part of their revision process and 31 out of the 53 students strictly mentioned grammar as revision. Global revision has become a lost process in academia that must be vitalized. As programs that strive to help students become better writers, the university composition courses and writing centers must work toward redefining the revision process. University instructors outside of the Writing Program view both writing centers and composition courses as service resources to “fix” students’ grammar, placing emphasis on lower-order rather than higher order concerns. Instead, both resources are working toward the same goal to improve students’ rhetoric and writing and, therefore, holding an important role on university campuses. Composition courses and writing centers must unite to support each other in their efforts toward teaching students to apply global revision strategies as well as collaborate in redefining their roles as valuable writing resources on campus.

The missions of composition courses and writing centers share many similarities. At Ball State University, students are required to take English 103, or Eng 103's equivalent, English 101 and 102, and English 104. English 103 focuses on developing students' understanding of rhetoric and writing while English 104 focuses on advancing students' understanding and application of the research process. The Ball State Writing Center provides writing support to students in one-on-one feedback sessions with a tutor. While both resources assist students in thinking about form, content, and context in their writing, unfortunately, Nancy Maloney Grimm's argument (1996) remains true over fifteen years later that "a lack of dialogue between writing center workers and composition teachers maintains the status quo" (Gilles 5; p. 524). To explore ways this gap can be filled between writing centers and composition courses, I interviewed three Ball State composition instructors, administered surveys to the composition instructors' students in one of their courses, and examined the Ball State composition syllabi from Fall 2011 through Spring 2012. To redefine and vitalize the lost process of revision, composition instructors must promote the writing center in their courses, teach students multiple revision strategies, and use peer review in a beneficial way, while writing centers need to better communicate their purpose to composition instructors as well as provide educational programs for composition instructors that are based on writing center research.

When looking at Fall 2011-Spring 2012 syllabi for Ball State composition courses, the written promotion for the Writing Center was not as present or compelling as it could have been. 42% of syllabi did not even briefly mention the Writing Center. Syllabi are valuable advertising places for instructors to advocate student use of the Writing Center because, on the first day of the semester, all students receive a syllabus that includes their

semester projects and class expectations. When introducing these projects or papers, instructors can suggest that students take advantage of the Writing Center by referring to their advertisement in the syllabi. If the instructor links a paper to the Writing Center, the student will then see the practical use of the Writing Center and feel more compelled to set up an appointment. It is especially important for composition courses to advertise it because the course goal is to improve students' writing and rhetoric, which is exactly the same goal as the Writing Center. Building on this, since most students at Ball State are required to take the Writing Program's composition courses as part of the common core curriculum, the Writing Program should be one of the main channels through which the Writing Center is promoted, working in tandem together to support each other and the students. Still though, many of the instructors continue to ignore and not promote the Writing Center.

However, many of the syllabi that did mention the Writing Center did so with enthusiasm and recognized its services as more valuable than being the grammar police. Most instructors used the standard statement: "The Writing Center at Ball State offers free one-to-one writing feedback to all students in all classes. Peer tutors can help students with many writing projects from essays to PowerPoint presentations to resumes, and at all stages from brainstorming to final drafts." This standard statement correctly defines the purposes of the Writing Center, but its rhetoric is detached from the course work and is unappealing to students. Rather, the more appealing statements were ones in which the instructors highly suggested and recommended going to the Writing Center as well as stressing that tutors will not edit or proofread with one Eng 104 instructor stating, "you will not find the grammar police" there. Another Eng 104 instructor, Angela, who I also

interviewed, wrote, "The Writing Center is full of awesome people," demonstrating that the Center is not intimidating. Another instructor wrote, "Students who work with the Writing Tutors consistently turn in better papers because they have gone through the editing and revision process again," advocating the helpfulness of the tutors to the students in her particular class. Personalizing writing center promotions is of the utmost importance for students in order to make its services less intimidating and more appealing in its effectiveness. Since most students are required to take composition courses early in their college careers, composition instructors play a crucial role in properly introducing students to writing centers in order for students to then take full advantage of its uses throughout their college experiences.

Another good way to promote writing centers is to have students listen to a presentation by a writing center tutor. The best way though is for students to tour the Writing Center with the class. Students are then able to connect a tutor's face and a specific place with the Writing Center. As sharing your writing with tutors can be intimidating, seeing the place and tutors can decrease this anxiety. When introducing the center, tutors should stress that the Center is useful to any writer at any writing level to dispel the stereotype that three students voiced when surveyed about visiting the Center in the future; they responded, "Overall, it seemed like a resource below my writing level," "I don't see the need," and "I have never really struggled with writing." These students incorrectly see writing centers as resources only for poor, struggling writers; instructors and writing center directors and tutors are responsible for changing this stereotype through promoting the Writing Center as a place for writers of all levels.

Also when surveyed, 39 out of 53 students expressed that peer reviews are useful. The last two students mentioned, who both expressed that they would not visit the writing center in the future, also indicated that they found peer reviews helpful, respectively stating, “you get others’ perspectives on how to write your paper in the most effective way” as well as “it allows someone else to look for mistakes and see if it is clear enough to understand.” Both students’ views on peer review mirror the purpose of writing center tutoring sessions. Peer tutors provide another perspective and feedback to student writers on their papers and help student writers clearly express their ideas. The students expressed interest in receiving another perspective on their paper is exactly the service that the writing center provides for free to students. With such a positive response from students regarding peer review, writing centers should consider advertising as a peer review service that provides strong, helpful writing feedback from peers in a pressure-free environment.

Many composition instructors teach revision through peer review workshops, seeing it as beneficial in teaching students the communal aspect of revision as well as increasing the students’ critical thinking skills, yet instructors worry about its effectiveness. Brad, an Eng 104 instructor, stresses that effective revision is an acquired skill. Therefore, it is the composition courses and writing centers’ responsibility to teach students how to effectively revise. Brad fears that, without providing students with a worksheet or any guidance, students will not provide good feedback to their peers. In responses such as “Oh, it was really good,” students are not engaged in critically thinking about the writer’s rhetorical moves. To better approach peer review workshops, Brad and Angela, another Eng 104 instructor, both modeled effective questioning for peer review as

a whole class to then prepare the students to continue this critical thinking in smaller groups. Writing centers similarly push students to engage in critically thinking about their writing when revising through asking the client multiple questions such as, “Where is your thesis? Why did you decide to put your thesis at the end of this particular paragraph?” When peer review teaches students to critically think during the revision process about all angles of their paper rather than only grammar, the students are learning how to see their paper globally.

Not only do peer review and the writing center allow students to critically think about their writing, students are also learning the communal aspect of revision by reading their work aloud to an audience. Mary Ann, an English 102 instructor, states, “I think reading a draft aloud is probably the single most important thing you can do for revision. I think when you read a draft aloud in front of an audience, you’re being held responsible for what you wrote in a very tangible way.” The three instructors I interviewed each stressed not only the importance of hearing “your voice” (Angela), but also the importance of being held accountable for your writing. At the Ball State Writing Center, we as tutors also ask students to read their work aloud for students to hear their voice and to be more aware of their audience. Students are able to understand the reader-writer relationship when they share their work with others. They are able to see the practical need for clarity in their structure and style so that the reader can comprehend their message; by teaching revision as a communal process, the students’ ideas of revision expand from just surface level revisions to more global revisions based on their use of sources, credibility, organization, and thesis.

Mary Ann expresses her concern for peer review, which many instructors share, stating, “I don’t know how beneficial the comments they’re getting from their peers really are.” On the survey, the few students that disliked peer reviews indicated similar reasons to the instructors’ concerns. They wrote that peer review effectiveness “depends on if you have a helpful peer” and “a lot of times students do not revise my paper well.” While hesitations exist about the benefits of peer review, students are calling for it when it is taught with proper instruction as one student in Angela’s class insists, “they are the only part of the revision process [that] I believe is essential.”

Through modeling the revision and peer review process as well as teaching multiple revision strategies throughout the class, students can, as according to Brad, “figure out what kind of questions will illicit good feedback [with...] the instructor’s help.” As Angela asserts, revision is now seen as a cyclical process. It is a process in which the writer is constantly revising throughout the process of writing, moving a paragraph or changing the thesis; therefore, if instructors are teaching students that revision is a process that occurs only at the end of writing a rough draft where they receive feedback on grammar from their peers, students view revision as just that. This was seen in the students’ survey responses. Instead, composition instructors should try, as Angela does, to “incorporate peer review into the body of [their] class and [...] not isolate it as this thing that [they] do four times a semester.” With this, composition instructors should conduct peer reviews throughout the writing process, grouping students at the beginning to brainstorm topics, then in the middle to discuss their thesis and use of supporting sources, and at the end to discuss structure. Likewise, writing centers should promote their services as places to help students at any part in the writing process from brainstorming to researching to organizing

information into paragraphs. Consequently, students will begin to see revision as a process rather than a final step taken to quickly fine tune the surface of the writing before turning it in for a grade.

Peer reviews at the Writing Center can also help students revise their work throughout the writing process as well. Writing centers need to reach out to composition course instructors to redefine their purpose within Writing Programs as well as create a meaningful role they can play within the instructors' courses. Brad describes the Writing Center as another part of his "coaching team" and Angela describes it as "a go between the instructor and the student." Writing centers should be places for students to turn to for writing assistance in a pressure-free environment that instructors can trust to provide strong intelligent writing feedback to their students. In his syllabus, an Eng 104 instructor promotes the Writing Center to his students as a resource to use, because he knows that, realistically, he does not have the time to meet individually with each of his students every time they might need help. The Writing Center can be that extra support system for instructors. With their help, instructors can allow students the opportunity to revise after consulting with a writing center tutor and requiring that the revisions be more global revisions rather than strictly editing as many students rarely place the effort into making global revisions when given the opportunity to revise; instead, they focus on easier grammar edits. In order to provide the best service for their students, instructors could present their course's projects and papers to the Writing Center directors and tutors so they know they can trust that the tutors understand the assignment. The tutors can then provide the composition students with specific effective feedback; to do this, writing center directors must build relationships with composition instructors.

In addition to expanding students' opportunities for revision, by interacting with and using writing centers to their full potential, composition instructors can learn helpful instruction strategies. Angela states, "Writing center research can help me be a better instructor in my classroom." Writing centers can provide educational programs each month that teach composition instructors new revision strategies as well as give writing tools that the instructors can present to their students. At these meetings, composition instructors can also inform the tutors about their class updates on assignments and papers that they can expect in the coming weeks as well as answer any questions the tutors might have about the assignments that composition students are presently bringing to the Writing Center. Through these meetings, writing centers and composition courses could truly begin to communicate and work together toward the goal of improving student writing.

Building a partnership at the university level between writing centers and composition courses is of the utmost importance in vitalizing and redefining the lost process of revision. As students continue to view revision as editing, composition instructors and writing centers need to work in tandem to properly promote the Writing Center, model revision and effective peer review sessions, and provide opportunities for students to revise their papers. Writing centers and composition courses must build a relationship founded on trust, communication, and an appreciation for the other's assistance to truly make an impact on students' understanding of revision.

East Central Writing Centers Association Conference

**It's the End of the World As We Know It: Negotiating Change in a
Writing Center Context**



**Annual Conference
March 30-31, 2012
IUPUI Campus Center**

How do expectations impact consultations? We'll share our research into writing center (WC) expectations held by various parties (students, consultants, school president, etc.), causes and effects of expectation, and our methods. Participants will engage in data analysis simulation to explore how understanding expectations may generate better WC communication and more effective change. (60-minute workshop)

CA 229

Re-WIRing the Writing Center: Meeting the Demands of the Writing-Intensive Requirement

Regina Kengla, Otterbein College

Danielle Cordaro, The University of Mt. Union

James Stull, Ohio Wesleyan University

Michael Mattison, Wittenberg University

This session is an assembly of colleagues from writing-intensive universities who will participate in a panel focusing on the challenges they face in supporting a writing-intensive program. I offer the perspective of a director new to a WI program and the panelists have experience in this role. (40-minute panel)

CA 237

Changing Roles: Student Revision and Peer Tutors

Emma Baumann, Ball State University

Katherine Greene, Ball State University

This panel shares the preliminary results of two studies that address the changing roles of revision and peer tutors in the writing center. We explore the Writing Center's role in redefining the process of revision and the tutor's role in transitioning from student to tutor. (40-minute panel)

CA 241

From the Roots to the Treetop: How Branching Out into the University and the Community Changes Perceptions of Conceptual Spaces

Kevin Lyon, DePaul University

Elizabeth Coughlin, DePaul University

Jennifer Finstrom, DePaul University

Elizabeth Kerper, DePaul University

Sowmya Sastri, DePaul University

DePaul's University Center for Writing-based Learning (UCWbL) uses the physical spaces of its two writing center locations to affect conceptual change for writers at every stage in their development, including community partner organizations who may not have direct access to writing tutors or theories of writing. (40-minute panel)